REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Specification

The Examiner objected to paras. 21 and 43 of the specification for informalities. Applicant has amended paras. 21 and 43 as suggested by the Examiner. Consequently, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 8, 17, 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawaguchi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0103528; hereinafter "Kawaguchi").

Claim 1 recites:

> "A system for managing multimedia contents in an intranet, comprising:
>
> a server operable to convert multimedia contents received through the Internet into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmitting the converted multimedia contents to the client."

The Examiner asserts that Kawaguchi teaches all of the claimed elements of claim 1 citing para. 60-64 and Figs. 14-28 of Kawaguchi in support. However, Kawaguchi does not teach or suggest an intranet or that multimedia content received through the Internet are converted into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet. Since Kawaguchi does not teach or suggest an intranet and the transmission of multimedia contents to clients of an intranet, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

To the extent independent claims 8, 17, and 24 recite similar subject matter, claims 8, 17, and 24 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 10-16, 18, 20-23 and 25-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi in view of Gehrmann, "Bluetooth™ Security White Paper," April 2002 (hereinafter "Gehrmann"). Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 10-16, 18, 20-23 and 25-33 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Gehrmann does not cure the deficiencies of Kawaguchi.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites "wherein the converted multimedia contents are encrypted and transmitted to the client." The Examiner concedes that Kawaguchi does not teach this aspect of the claim and cites Gehrmann, page 10, second paragraph, to cure the deficiency. The aspect of Gehrmann cited by the Examiner discloses that a security association is used to authenticate and encrypt all communication between two Bluetooth wireless devices. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that converted multimedia content are encrypted and transmitted to a client, as claimed. Specifically, Gehrmann is not concerned with the management of multimedia contents but is directed to a profile for a headset.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 9, 18 and 25 recite similar subject matter, they should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites "wherein the translated license is encrypted and transmitted to the client." The Examiner asserts that Gehrmann teaches that the use of Bluetooth™ will encrypt all

communications. However, Gehrmann merely discloses the encryption of communication between two wireless devices. There is no teaching or suggestion that a translated license is encrypted and transmitted to a client as claimed. Consequently, claim 4 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 11, 20 and 27 recite similar elements, they should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 6

Claim 6 recites:

> "...wherein the server comprises **a plurality of proxy managers** constructed according to DRM server groups, the **proxy managers each comprising:**
>
> **a platform authentication unit** operable to request a license for multimedia contents from a corresponding DRM server group which provides the multimedia contents, and performing registration of the client..."

The Examiner asserts that paras. 234-235 of Kawaguchi teach this aspect of the claim. The aspect of Kawaguchi cited by the Examiner discloses content in storage 15a is checked out to storage 15b through on-vehicle information gateway 17. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a plurality of proxy managers, let alone that each proxy manager comprises a platform authentication unit.

Claim 6 further recites "a content conversion unit operable to decrypt multimedia contents received from the corresponding DRM server group, and converting the decrypted multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for the client." The Examiner asserts that paras. 62-63 of Kawaguchi teaches this aspect of the claim. The respective paragraphs cited by the Examiner disclose a conversion policy includes changes between different attributes and right information conversation based on a difference in communication

means and converting content corresponding to right information according to the capacity of the repository of the transmission destination.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion of decrypting multimedia contents and converting the decrypted multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for the client, as claimed.

Claim 6 further recites "a license translation unit operable to translate a license received from the corresponding DRM server group into a license having a format suitable for the client." The Examiner asserts that para. 245 of Kawaguchi teaches this aspect of the claim. Paragraph 245 of Kawaguchi discloses a right gateway converts right information according to need and transmits the conversion result to a content controller. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a license translation unit as claimed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 6 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 12 and 28 recites similar subject matter, they should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV. Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-33 in view of Application No. 10/922,863

Claim 1-33 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-12 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/922,863; publication number US 2005/0065891 (hereinafter "Lee '891").

The cited commonly owned application Lee '891 was filed on August 23, 2004 and the current application was filed on January 23, 2004.

In order to establish a rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner must show that the claims are not **patentably distinct.** Further,

a rejection under non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting is based on the language of the **claims**. To determine if obviousness-type double patenting applies, a determination must be made as to the difference in scope and content between the patent claim language and the prior art. In addition, a determination must be made regarding the obviousness of the claim to one of ordinary skill in the art. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper only if a claim in the application is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. MPEP 804(II)(B)(1).

Upon viewing the language of for example, claim 1 of Lee '891, it is clear that the claimed recitations do not teach the recitations of claim 1 of the current application. Specifically, Lee '891 is directed to granting a digital rights management license between a server and a plurality of devices. Lee '891 is not directed to the management of multimedia contents as claimed in the present application. Further, Lee '891 is not at all concerned with proxy managers comprising a platform authentication unit, a content conversion unit and a license translation. Therefore, the claimed limitations are patentably distinct and are not obvious in view of Lee '891.

Consequently, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-33 in view of Lee '891 should be withdrawn.

V. Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-33 in view of Application No. 11/090,990

Claim 1-33 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-18 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 11/090,990; US Publication No. 2005/0216763 (hereinafter "Lee '763").

The cited commonly owned application Lee '763 was filed on March 28, 2005 and the current application was filed on January 23, 2004.

As discussed above, in order to establish a rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner must show that the claims are not **patentably distinct.** Further, a rejection under non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting is based on the language of the **claims**. To determine if obviousness-type double patenting applies, a determination must be made as to the difference in scope and content between the patent claim language and the prior art. In addition, a determination must be made regarding the obviousness of the claim to one of ordinary skill in the art. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper only if a claim in the application is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. MPEP 804(II)(B)(1).

Upon viewing the language of for example, claim 1 of Lee '763, it is clear that the claimed recitations do not teach the recitations of claim 1 of the current application.

Specifically, Lee '763 is directed to the playback of content using a portable storage. Lee '763 is not directed to the management of multimedia contents as claimed in the present application. Further, Lee '763 is not at all concerned with proxy managers comprising a platform authentication unit, a content conversion unit and a license translation. Therefore, the claimed limitations are patentably distinct and are not obvious in view of Lee '763.

Consequently, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-33 in view of Lee '763 should be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 1, 2007